THE
Dan Smoot Report

Vol. 14, No. 38 (Broadcast 682) September 16, 1968 Dallas, Texas

DAN SMOOT

PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES, 1968

While Hubert Humphrey was still saying that Negroes riot because they see on television things they want but do not have, and was boasting that if *he* lived in a slum "you'd have more trouble than you have had already, because I've got enough spark left in me to lead a mighty good revolt under those conditions"—George Wallace was saying that the raging mobs trying to destroy our cities do not riot because of poverty but because they want to steal and destroy, and know they will not be punished for their criminal acts.

While Richard Nixon was lobbying behind the scenes in Washington, putting pressure on Republicans in Congress to support the Democrat-sponsored forced-housing section in the 1968 Civil Rights bill; and while Nixon was paying public tribute to the principal inciter of mob violence in the United States by attending the funeral of Martin Luther King—George Wallace was saying that the Civil Rights bill, like those before it, was setting an example of lawlessness because the bill itself is a violation of the supreme law of our land, the Constitution; and Wallace was saying that the police of our nation, and not the inciters of hate and violence, should be given the support and respect of political leaders.

While a majority of Democrats and Republicans in Congress were rubber-stamping President Johnson's unconstitutional, multi-billion-dollar great-society programs allegedly intended to prevent rioting by eliminating the "root causes" of Negro unrest—George Wallace was saying that the great-society programs were, in many instances, rewarding rioting and, in some cases, directly subsidizing rioters.

While liberal Democrats and liberal Republicans were vying with each other to produce more schemes for using tax money to bribe rioters not to riot, George Wallace was saying that the way to stop riots is to support the police in quick, strict enforcement of existing laws.

By the time the Republican and Democrat nominating conventions were held in August, 1968, even liberal politicians had come to realize that *the* political issue this year is the growing anarchy in our

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT is published weekly by The Dan Smoot Report, Inc., Box 9538, Dallas Texas 75214 (office at 6441 Gaston Ave.). Subscriptions: $18.00 for 2 years; $10.00, 1 year; $6.00, 6 months. Dan Smoot was born in Missouri, reared in Texas. With BA and MA degrees from SMU (1938 and 1940), he joined the Harvard faculty (1941) as a Teaching Fellow, doing graduate work in American civilization. From 1942 to 1951, he was an FBI agent; from 1951 to 1955, a commentator on national radio and television. In 1955, he started his present independent, free-enterprise business: publishing this REPORT and abbreviating it each week for radio and TV broadcasts available for commercial sponsorship by business firms.

Copyright by Dan Smoot, 1968. Second Class mail privilege authorized at Dallas, Texas.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cities. It was George Wallace who made them realize this. They perceived that Wallace had captured the support of millions by repeating the refrain: "The people are sick and tired of hearing psuedo-intellectual liberals praise the anarchists who are destroying our country, while hand-cuffing the police and accusing them of brutality for trying to protect the persons and property of decent, law-abiding citizens. The people are sick and tired of being afraid to use their streets and parks or even to venture out in their own front yards at night, because if someone molests them, the molester goes free while the police who arrest him get suspended or reprimanded or demoted."

So, both major parties tried to steal Wallace's thunder. In their 1968 platforms, both Republicans and Democrats came down hard on the issue of law and order—in almost identical words. Nixon's Republican platform says: "We will not tolerate violence!" Humphrey's Democrat platform says: "We must not and will not tolerate violence."

Nixon and Humphrey promise the same remedies. Both, still assuming that "poverty" causes crime and mob violence, will continue Johnson's program of "taking from the haves to give to the have-nots" on the premise that this will make the have-nots happy enough not to riot.

They ignore the proven fact that paying blackmail simply begets more blackmail.

They also ignore the fact that their proposed programs are unconstitutional. The federal government has no constitutional authority to operate Nixon's proposed Human Investment Program, as it has none to operate Johnson-Humphrey's Manpower Training and Development Program. The federal government has no constitutional authority to operate Nixon's proposed Domestic Development Bank, as it has none to operate Humphrey's proposed Marshall Plan for the cities.

When the Nixon and Humphrey platforms get down to the specifics of law enforcement, they both recommend unconstitutional gun-control laws and unconstitutional programs of federal aid to local law enforcement.

In outlining what *he* would do to promote law and order, George Wallace seems conscious of the constitutional limitations on the powers of a President. What Wallace promises to do about law and order could be done *legally* by a President under the Constitution; it would produce a powerful deterrent to crime and mob violence; and it would not cost taxpayers the billions of dollars that Nixon and Humphrey promise to spend.

Wallace promises, as President, to use the prestige, influence, and moral leadership of his office to create strong public support for law enforcement officers and agencies. He promises to focus public and legislative attention and criticism on courts that violate the rights of society for the benefit of criminals and rioters. He promises he will urge Congress to use its constitutional power to reverse or abrogate harmful Supreme Court decisions; and he promises to act—in the District of Columbia where the President has constitutional authority to act—to set an example of law enforcement. As he puts it: "When I am President, the streets of Washington, D. C., will be safe for decent citizens if I have to post troops five feet apart all over the District."

Big government is an issue that troubles Americans almost as much as the issues of lawlessness and the Vietnam war. Early in September, 1968, the Gallup Poll released results of a survey which revealed that *46% of the public regards big government as the worst threat to this country.*

What the Gallup Poll now reveals as an attitude of almost half the American people is an attitude I have been expressing for more than 20 years—in public speeches and on radio and television broadcasts, in press interviews, and in the pages of this *Report* since the first issue was published on June 29, 1955.

The Founding Fathers knew that the primary threat to an individual's life, liberty, and property is generally the government under which he lives. They knew that all governments will, if permitted, waste the labors of the people and ultimately enslave the people, under the pretext of taking care of the people.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That is why the Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution as an inviolable contract carefully limiting federal power to what is specified in the contract.

The broad, undefined powers of government were left with the states. Hence, it is legal for state governments to experiment with social legislation to meet the changing needs of changing times. If they err—going too far or not far enough in the use of their powers—the example and competition of other states can induce correction.

When the federal government is permitted to engage in activities not authorized by the Constitution, the Constitution no longer has fixed meaning. There remains no brake on federal power. The floodgates to tyranny are opened. Thus, the old American constitutional system has been eroded away. Step by step through the years, we have permitted political and economic power to gravitate to the federal government. The unconstitutional power of the federal government has been growing like an uncontrolled, fatal parasite.

Liberals contend that government must be big and strong enough to do to and for the people what government officials think good for the people—must have absolute power to promote the general welfare. But when government assumes the power to promote the general welfare, it assumes power to determine what the general welfare is.

A big government which can take money from your neighbors to subsidize your farm or business or send you welfare checks or make you low-interest loans from the public treasury—can also confiscate *your* property.

How do the three presidential candidates of 1968 stand on the issue of big government? Humphrey praises the accomplishments of big government and promises full speed ahead to make government bigger and stronger. Nixon pays lip service to "free enterprise"; but the programs he promises are, in their essence, the same as those of his Democrat rival.

George Wallace? Long before the Gallup Poll discovered that the people fear big government, Wallace was saying:

"There is a strong backlash among the voters all across the country, but it is not against anyone because of race. It is against the idea of a big federal government trying to solve problems that should be solved on the local level."

Wallace himself, however, supports some unconstitutional aspects of big government. He says, for example, he believes in federal aid to states, but does not believe in federal controls.

The federal government has no constitutional authority to give aid to states. Hence, a states-rights constitutionalist should work toward stopping all federal aid programs, and reducing federal taxes accordingly, leaving to states and local governments the tax revenues now going to Washington for illegal federal-aid programs. Then, if the people want the programs presently being financed with tax money from Washington, they could raise the money and direct the programs at the state and local level. This would not only eliminate stupid and tyrannical federal controls, but would also provide better programs and save taxpayers billions of dollars a year, by eliminating the political favoritism, waste, corruption, inefficiency, and costly red-tape that are inevitable in the present system of allowing the federal government to take tax revenues out of a state and then send part back as aid.

Though Wallace does not take a sound constitutionalist stand on such basic issues as federal aid, his position on most issues is closer to American constitutional principles than the position of Humphrey or Nixon.

No constitutionalist could, in good conscience, support Hubert Humphrey. Some think they must support Nixon on the premise that he would at least be better than Humphrey.

It is true that when Richard Nixon was serving his country well by exposing Alger Hiss as a Soviet spy, Hubert Humphrey was helping to found Americans for Democratic Action (ADA)—a group of radical leftists who, though anti-commu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nists in the sense that they do not advocate violent Marxist-Leninist techniques to establish socialism, are establishing socialism by infiltrating all branches of government and by inculcating their ideas into the minds of leaders and opinion-formers outside of government.

But the "new Nixon" we hear about is the Nixon who became Vice President in 1953. Since that time, Nixon's public stands on major issues have differed from those of Humphrey (if they have differed at all) only in degree and in semantic tone.

It must be remembered, moreover, that many conservatives voted for Eisenhower and Nixon in 1952 and 1956, on the premise that they would at least be better than Adlai Stevenson and his crowd. As it turned out, Eisenhower and Nixon continued and expanded the socialist-internationalist programs that Stevenson approved; and they emasculated the anti-socialist movement by lulling many conservatives into feeling we had a pro-freedom administration because it was Republican—and because Nixon had once been an effective anti-communist.

Probably, the very least that George Wallace will accomplish in this election is to throw it into the House of Representatives. That probability alone would be sufficient reason for me to support Wallace—even if he were as bad as his worst enemies say.

Wallace poses the first *real* threat ever made to the power establishment (often called the invisible government) in control of both Democrat and Republican parties.

We do not have a two-party system. The Democrat and Republican parties are rival factions of one great political force. They are rivals for office and power, but they represent the same political philosophy — which is big-government welfare-statism, or, in a word, socialism. This is why Democrats and Republicans—though bitter enemies in elections which do no more than determine whether Democrats or Republicans will hold office—subdue their fraternal animosities and join hands to oppose someone who threatens the power establishment which controls both parties.

If George Wallace gets enough votes to "shake the eye teeth" (as he says) of the Democrat and Republican parties, he will create a new political force which could come to represent, truly and fundamentally, those Americans who want to save their Republic by re-establishing limited constitutional government.

LATER: More about the "constitutional crisis" that Republicans and Democrats say would be caused by throwing the election into the House; on Wallace as a "threat to our two-party system"; on the candidates' positions with regard to Vietnam and other major issues.

THE INVISIBLE GOVERNMENT

The most recent printing of *The Invisible Government* in paperback sells at these prices: 1 copy $1.00; 10 copies, $9.00; 25 copies, $20.00; 50 copies, $37.50; 100 copies, $60.00.

All previous paperback printings are sold out. We still have, however, clothback library edition copies of *The Invisible Government* at $4.00 each (original price, $5.00).

Please notify us of any change of address *before* you move. With increased postal rates, we no longer can afford to remail issues returned by the Post Office.

SUBSCRIBE TO THE DAN SMOOT REPORT:
6 mo. — $6.00; 1 yr. — $10.00; 2 yr. — $18.00

REPRINTS OF THIS ISSUE
(for bulk mailing to one address):

1 copy	$ .25	100 copies	$ 6.50
10 copies	1.00	200 copies	12.00
25 copies	2.00	500 copies	28.00
50 copies	3.50	1000 copies	50.00

Texans Add 3% for Sales Tax

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT TAylor 1-2303
BOX 9538 DALLAS, TEXAS 75214

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED